

by the researches of the Engineering Experiment Station of the Iowa State College, which recently, according to the "Scientific American," made a survey of the traffic which passed a certain point on the road between Ames and Des Moines. During ten consecutive days 1,995 vehicles carrying 5,561 passengers went by the observation post. Of these vehicles 647 were classified as farm traffic, 1,227 as interurban, and only 121 as tourist. Out of every 17 vehicles which passed 16 were primarily devoted to the transportation of passengers. Of the total number of vehicles recorded, 1,752 fell in the class of motor vehicles and bicycles, while but 243 were drawn by horses. The "Scientific American" estimates that at least ninety-four per cent of all the traffic passing over the road at this point can be closely identified either with local farms or with local traffic of a utilitarian character.

Such a showing as this concerning the present usefulness of automobile transportation is proof enough that the annual series of exhibitions of automobiles, the first and largest of which opened in New York City on January 5, is of true war-time value. The New York exhibition represents, this year, an event of unusual interest, for it indicates the manner in which one of our greatest industries is adapting itself to war conditions.

This year's cars show few departures from standardized practice. There was increasing refinement of detail in some instances, a notable effort towards the elimination of surplus weight, and a distinct and creditable effort to accentuate economy in operation. One of the leading automobile companies, whose cars have occupied for many years a commanding place in the automobile world, openly stated in its catalogue that it did not urge any one to buy an automobile who did not need a machine as a matter of business economy. An officer of another concern, which has been building cars for twenty-two years, remarked that he was distinctly glad that his company had planned for only a conservative output during the coming year, for he regarded the present situation as one which called for conservatism and intelligent restriction of output.

Just as the railways have found it necessary to cut out from their schedules certain passenger trains and to consolidate others, the automobile industry will find it necessary to specialize output and to devote its major attention to the manufacture of war supplies and vehicles designed not primarily for luxury or pleasure but for utility.

There is no such fuel shortage threatened in this country as exists in Continental countries, for the United States is not largely dependent on ocean traffic for its fuel supply. For this reason American automobile manufacturers can rightfully look to a demand for their products which does not exist abroad.

THE MORGAN COLLECTION

Besides the individual objects and groups of objects—sometimes quite large—given to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, in New York City, by the late John Pierpont Morgan, and the works of art given to it from his estate by his son, other parts of the Morgan collection have been left in the Museum as a loan. From the collection certain objects have been sold. The remainder, much the larger part, is, we are glad to learn, to stay in the Museum.

It consists of more than three thousand objects—pictures (on another page there is an illustration of one of the most famous canvases), sculptures, enamels, ivories, glass, pottery, antiquities, armor, jewelry, watches, clocks, snuff-boxes, and other objects of art. These are in addition to the collection of ancient glass and pottery, which is mentioned separately, as Dr. Robinson, Director of the Museum, explains, "because the forty-five hundred items it contains are mainly fragments, and might be thought to swell the number unduly."

The elder John Pierpont Morgan was probably the greatest collector of our time of manuscripts, books, and works of art. He made numerous gifts of them to public institutions in this country and Europe, but retained the bulk of his collection, from time to time sending things as loans to the Metropolitan Museum, and these were occasionally in large numbers, as, for example, his Chinese porcelains. He considered his loans as parts of his "collection," the various subdivisions being regarded by him as parts of that collection, not as separate collections.

He wanted, as he said, to make some suitable disposition of them, or of such portions of them as he might determine, which would render them permanently available for the instruction and pleasure of the American people.

Mr. Morgan died in 1913, before he could carry out his purpose. In his will he expressed the hope that his son, John Pierpont Morgan, Jr., to whom the collection would pass, should in such manner as he might think best make either a permanent disposition or from time to time permanent dispositions of such portion of it as he might determine. The son has now substantially carried out his father's intentions.

Disposing of certain pieces of bronze, tapestry, porcelain, and furniture, Mr. Morgan, Jr., has wisely reserved for the public things which the museums could not obtain. His first gift to the Metropolitan was valued by some judges at fully \$3,000,000. A principal feature of this gift was Raphael's Colonna Madonna. About the same time Mr. Morgan made a great gift to the Morgan Memorial at Hartford (the elder Morgan was born at Hartford) of Greek, Roman, and Phœnician enameled glass, of Greek and Roman bronzes, of objects in ivory and silver, of Italian majolica, Sèvres porcelain, and Dresden ware.

Now comes another and greater gift. Its value, according to some, reaches \$7,500,000. Any estimate, however, is hard to make—certainly the Museum has made none—for the collection is practically unique. Its chief significance to the Metropolitan lies in the enamels and ivories, for in these branches of art that Museum is now ahead of any in the world.

MR. BARNARD'S LINCOLN

The hue and cry concerning Mr. Barnard's statue of Lincoln, replicas of which have been proposed for London and Paris, calls forth some interesting reflections from M. André Michel. Writing in the Paris "Temps," he says:

Without having the right to express a personal opinion concerning a work which I know only through an illustration published in The Outlook of October 17, 1917, I am much inclined to defend Mr. Barnard and his work against their detractors. He has represented Lincoln standing, his hands crossed on his stomach in a familiar attitude and without any "pose." The strongly marked face seems to have been treated with singular power; the accent of individuality has been placed there in the simplest and most striking manner. No one of the statues which I remember to have seen in America—even that very distinguished one which is in Chicago on the shores of Lake Michigan, where Augustus Saint-Gaudens has shown Lincoln standing in front of the Presidential chair, . . . his head bent over his breast, one hand on the lapel of his coat, and the other behind his back—has seemed to leave with me a more vivid or stronger impression of his personality.

Lincoln would gain nothing by a conventional embellishment, by academic attitudes, by symbolic accessories, or by elegances which amount to falsehoods. . . . Austere truth is more in place than any "arrangements." Lincoln was of humble origin and was not ashamed of it. He did not dress himself according to the latest fashion and cared little about his toilet. But upon his roughly hewn face, gaunt but illuminated with inner fire, atop a great, somewhat disjointed body, there was reflected an unconquerable energy, an incorruptible conscience. . . . We shall accept at Paris, as at London, with the greatest friendship the "Abraham Lincoln" which will be offered to us.

M. Michel points out, as no one else, we believe, has done, the parallel between the storm which has descended upon Mr. Barnard and the storm which descended upon Houdon, the French sculptor who essayed to create a statue of Washington. The parallel is certainly an interesting one. But there is also a contrast; for Houdon was criticised for proposing to make a conventional statue on the classical model, while Mr. Barnard is criticised because his work is not conventional.

Interest aroused by the controversy over Mr. Barnard's statue has extended to other sculptured representations of Lincoln. On another page we print a reproduction of Mr. Andrew O'Connor's figure of Lincoln from a photograph. Mr. O'Connor is a native of Worcester, Massachusetts, and began his study of sculpture as his father's pupil when a child. As in his other work, there is dignity in this Lincoln statue, and, in particular, there is idealism in Mr. O'Connor's interpretation of Lincoln's face.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/mrbarnardslincol00unse>



A NEW STATUE OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN, BY ANDREW O'CONNOR

This statue, which has been on exhibition in New York City, is destined for the Capitol grounds of Springfield, Illinois. Those who have followed the discussion over the merits of the Barnard statue of Lincoln, as well as all admirers of the Great Emancipator, will be interested in Mr. O'Connor's conception of his subject. "Whatever I know or have learned," he says, "is in this work." Mr. O'Connor was a pupil of Daniel C. French. Of late years he has lived in France. Among his many works are a statue of General Lew Wallace, at Washington; "Adam and Eve," Corcoran Gallery, Washington; "Justice," Essex County Court-House, Newark, N. J.; Ornamental Doors, Luxembourg Museum, Paris; General Lawton, Indianapolis; Statuary at the Main Entrance, Custom-House, New York City; The Vanderbilt Memorial, St. Bartholomew's Church, New York City; "Nehemiah," Museum of Budapest.

system for the arms, another for the legs, and a third for the lungs, throat, and stomach to realize how defective the service rendered by a number of un-coordinated railways must be, and what a service the President has rendered to the country in putting these railways under the direction of a single head. But the analogy between the circulatory system of the body and our railway systems as it has been fails in another respect. Through the arteries and veins the blood cells move as they are required without relation to their identity. There is, so to speak, no change of cars or motive power. The blushing woman and the wounded man do not have to wait until some particular artery is cleared for the passage of a special sort of cell that travels only on a single route.

There are different species of cells, it is true, just as there are freight and passenger cars. Each species has a different function to perform, but when they are needed the cells best adapted for the work that is to be done are rushed along the shortest route to the point at which they are required. In other words, there is no exclusive designation of rolling stock and equipment for use on particular lines. They are all public highways over which any traffic may be moved by the shortest or most convenient route, subject only to such regulation as may be necessary to avoid collision or congestion. With our railways as they were this was made impossible by self-interest and competition. Transformed as they may be, under the authority given by the President, it is entirely possible that the railway tracks of the United States may become the roadways of the Nation, over which its traffic may be moved by the shortest or easiest routes, irrespective of their previous ownership or affiliation. Just here it is worth remarking that such a change would be a reversion to first principles.

From the earliest time the construction and maintenance of roads that were open to all has been one of the functions of government.

About one hundred years ago Congress committed itself to the policy of building post roads over which the stage-coaches and prairie schooners of those days should carry the traffic of the Nation. Two of these roads over the Alleghanies were completed and are in use to-day. Many more were planned, and would no doubt have been built if the railways had not superseded them. Of the first railways not a few were built by the States, and more probably would have been so built but for the eagerness of private capital to embark in a business that seemed to promise great profits.

The same idea of providing a public highway open to all for the transportation of freight and passengers obtained when the various States undertook to dig the canals that were to connect our lakes and rivers with the sea, and provide the transportation system of which De Witt Clinton dreamed. Through these canals any boat might travel irrespective of its ownership or the rate of freight charged, and the only function of the States was to see that there was no impediment to the traffic or discrimination in its treatment.

In its essence the principle thus applied is identical with the one that is embodied in the doctrine for which we are now fighting, viz., "the freedom of the seas," by which is meant the right of unobstructed transportation for neutral commerce in time of war and for all commerce when the world is at peace.

That our insistence upon respect for this doctrine abroad should have made it possible for us to extend its application at home may be something more than a coincidence. In both cases the result will be to equalize opportunity and dispossess private interest from the enjoyment of peculiar privileges. For years the Nation has been considering whether this dispossession would be wise and just. The Inter-State Commerce Commission was formed, and for a time it was hoped that the control it was empowered to exercise might correct the evils of which both the carriers and the public complained. The result was, however, disappointing. Both the authority and the policy of the Commission were restrictive rather than constructive.

The Sherman Law, moreover, stood in the way and stopped all progress toward co-ordination by consolidation, combination, or pooling. Competition by rate-cutting or rebates was prevented, but competition in service continued; and the stronger roads, which could afford it, succeeded in obtaining a larger share of the traffic by the employment of solicitors, through

whom the obvious advantages of quick movement and convenient terminals were kept constantly before shippers.

Meantime the cost of operation was increasing. Wages, coal, steel, oil, cars, engines, and everything else required in the running of a railway advanced rapidly. The Inter-State Commerce Commission grudgingly and tardily allowed a slight increase in freight rates, but it was not commensurate with the increase in expenses. Net earnings commenced to fall off, the credit of the railways became impaired, the capital required to buy new equipment, improve terminals, and build extensions could not be had, and our transportation facilities ceased to grow, while the business of the country was expanding rapidly.

This was the situation when the war broke out in 1914. The impulse that the European demand soon gave to American activity created a traffic that taxed the carrying capacity of the American railways to the limit by the end of 1916.

Their gross earnings were increasing, but expenses increased more rapidly; the net result was that they began to lose, the movement of traffic became difficult, great congestion resulted, and when we entered the war and undertook to create, equip, and move an army of one or two million men overseas, to build many new naval vessels and an enormous merchant marine, our transportation system broke down. The rest of the story is current history vividly impressed upon the public mind by the distress that has been caused by the coal shortage, which is largely, if not entirely, due to defective transportation.

It is not to the discredit of those who have hitherto managed the American railways that this condition should have come to exist. They were each of them heads of parts of an unco-ordinated system. They were charged with a dual responsibility. They had one obligation to the public and another to the owners of the properties they managed. To make money for their shareholders and provide the service that was demanded seemed to be impossible. It is, for instance, generally admitted that, taken in its entirety, the passenger traffic on our American railways does not pay. It must nevertheless be maintained, and when a railway president found it necessary to take off passenger trains or to impose a freight embargo he was literally between the devil and the deep sea. Had he controlled another and a parallel road, he could have sent the through freight by that route, but under the system that prevailed he had no such option. The Railroads War Board that was brought in to being some months ago tried to mobilize the country's traffic on some such plan, but was not successful because every car-load of freight taken from one road and given to another meant a decrease in the earnings of one property and an increase in the revenue of a competitor.

As each member of the War Board was pledged to make as much money as he could for the owners of his property, and as the railway presidents who were not on the Board had a similar obligation, it was not to be expected that they would entirely disregard it. It is, in fact, doubtful whether they had the legal or moral right to do so.

To meet this emergency the President stepped in. Acting under the authority given him by Congress in the Act approved August 29, 1916, whereby he "is empowered in time of war to take possession of and assume control of any system or systems of transportation," he has put the railways of the United States under control of Mr. McAdoo, who is directed to *enter upon negotiations with the several companies looking to agreements for just and reasonable compensation for the use of their properties on the basis of an annual guaranteed compensation above accruing depreciation and the maintenance of their properties equal to their average net incomes for the three-year period ending June 30, 1917. The result of these negotiations is to be reported to the President for such action as may be appropriate and lawful.*

The lines italicized are a quotation from the President's Message slightly paraphrased for brevity. They propose, it will be noticed, a basis upon which owners of the roads may be compensated or upon which their properties may be leased, but the President has no power to conclude a lease that shall involve the Government in any financial liability. In this regard the proposed arrangement is subject to the confirmation of Congress before it can be made effective. This phase of the matter is emphasized because there are some who assume that the